

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 are pending. Claim 1 is amended herein. Claim 26 has been added herein. Support for the amendment and new claim is found at least at page 11, lines 34-36 of the specification. Applicants do hereby declare their intent to file a continuation of the current application based upon claim 1 as previously presented. As such, there is no disclaimer of subject matter by the amendment herein.

**Applicants' Response to the Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

**Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 17, 20, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Iba et al. (JP 10-268294A).**

Applicants respectfully submit that Iba does not anticipate the presently claimed invention for at least the reason that the reference does not teach all the features of amended parent claim 1.

The Office, on page 12, section 23 of the Office Action addresses applicants' argument as to the thickness of the film disclosed by Iba of 60μm being a pre-stretched thickness. The Office Action asserts that there is no disclosure in the specification, particularly at paragraph [0035], that the 60μm thickness is in fact the pre-stretched thickness and further cites to paragraph [0029] of Iba. The Office maintains that these disclosures teach that the polarizer film with a thickness of 60μm is combined with transparence protection films of triacetylcellulose on both sides using adhesive, and that this is proof that the film at 60μm is a post-stretching thickness. Amended claim 1 recites that the thickness of the polarizer is 5 to 40 μm. Iba does not teach a

polarizer containing a dichroic material in a matrix, wherein an in-plane retardation at a measurement wavelength providing no absorption is in a range of 950 to 1350 nm and wherein the thickness of the polarizer is 5 to 40 $\mu$ m. According to the Office's own interpretation Iba requires a 60 $\mu$ m thickness to obtain the requisite properties. Wherefore, Iba does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention either expressly or inherently.

Further, applicants maintain their position that the treated film is subsequently stretched. As detailed in the prior response of January 17, 2008, in view of state of the art at the time of the Iba application, a polyvinyl alcohol film with a thickness of 60  $\mu$ m is stretched uniaxially by 5 to 6 times. The thickness of a polarizing plate to be obtained in this case will be about 24 to 27  $\mu$ m. When the stretched film thickness (d) is taken into account, it becomes clear that the film of Iba does not teach the required range of applicants' claim 1. See pages 2-4 of applicants' January 17, 2008 Response. As is seen in the table submitted in the prior response, the in-plane retardations of the polarizing plates 5-8 are not in the claimed range of 950 to 1350 nm. Therefore, Iba fails to describe a polarizer having each and every feature as set forth in applicants' claim 1. Wherefore, applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102.

#### **Applicants' Response to the Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

**Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iba et al. (JP 10-268294A) in view of Harita et al. (US 2001/0039319 A1).**

**Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iba et al. (JP 10-268294A) in view of Sugino et al. (JP 2002333522).**

**Claims 8, 16, 19, 22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iba et al. (JP 10-268294A) in view of Honda et al. (US 2001/0033349 A1).**

**Claims 11-13, 18 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iba et al. (JP 10-268294A) in view of Yoshimi et al. (JP 2001311826).**

As all these rejections rely on the rejection of parent claim 1 under Iba, applicants respectfully submit that by addressing the rejection to the parent claim, these rejections are likewise addressed by nature of their dependency.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.


Application No.: 10/522,187  
Art Unit: 2871

Amendment under 37 CFR §1.114  
Attorney Docket No.: 043168

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael J. Caridi", is written over the printed name.

Michael J. Caridi  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 56,171  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

MJC/ttw